

ADDRESS

OF

HON. ALBERT G. BROWN,

BEFORE

THE MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE

OF THE

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI,

NOVEMBER 8, 1859.

OBERLIN  
COLLEGE  

---

LIBRARY

WASHINGTON:

PRINTED BY LEMUEL TOWERS.

1859.

Carnegie Corp. Fol  
Briggs  
25

NOTE.—Two days after this address was delivered, I read, for the first time, Attorney-General Black's second pamphlet in reply to Judge Douglas. It has been assumed in Mississippi, that the pamphlet commits the Federal Government in all its departments.—Legislative, Judicial, and Executive—to the defence of the Southern people in their lives, their liberties, and their property—slaves included—both on the high seas *and in the Territories*. If the Attorney General means to be so understood, and will say so, I will then promptly admit that this address does him injustice. I want the admission from himself however. Conclusions from his language, drawn by others, may prove fallacious.

A. G. BROWN.

DECEMBER 7, 1859.

ALABAMA  
303100  
YRABRU  
307346

## ADDRESS.

---

FELLOW CITIZENS:

In what I have to say to you, to night, it will be my object to designate as clearly and as succinctly as possible the points of difference between the Northern and Southern Democracy—to point out the course which, in the present emergency of our political affairs, the Southern people ought to pursue—and the means they must employ to secure their Constitutional rights in the Union or out of it.

I speak of the points of difference between Northern and Southern Democrats, because at the North, outside of the Democratic party, we are opposed by a fanatical horde who trample without remorse on the Constitution, and pay as little regard to the rights of the South as the highwayman pays to the rights of his victim. It is clear that such a people have passed beyond the pale of reason, and I neither speak to them nor of them.

At the South we are opposed by the odds and ends of all parties, men so embittered by the contests of the past that they are almost ready to sink the Constitution—the union and the rights of the South, for the poor satisfaction of gaining a triumph over the Democratic party. If there be such men present I do not speak to them.

I come as a patriot to speak to patriots. In twenty-four years of political life I have not seen so many signs of danger as at the present. I am capable at such a time of rising above the petty prejudices of mere partyism, and I desire to address myself only to such as have the manhood to sink the politician in the higher character of the Southern patriot.

While I speak to the Democracy, I want it understood that I include every man of every party who feels that he can so far throw off party shackles as to act with the only political organization which pretends to nationality, or which has the ghost of a chance to save the country.

The National Democratic party may, by possibility, come to a better understanding—sink their differences in a patriotic grave, and heartily unite in a noble and manly effort to rescue the Constitution from the hands of its enemies, and lift the Union above the storm that now threatens its dissolution.

To reconcile differences of opinion when great ends like these are to be obtained, is an object worthy of the patriot's

ambition; and though I am not very hopeful of success, I should not discharge my duty to my country and my own conscience if I did not make an honest effort.

The great error into which the Northern mind has been betrayed, is this—that the legislative power of the Government, by whomsoever exercised, whether by Congress or a Territorial Legislature, may rightfully discriminate against slave property. To correct this error, and satisfy the Northern people that we possess equal political rights with themselves, are the ends to be attained before the Union and the Constitution can be regarded as safe, or peace be permanently established between the sections.

I assume that there is not one among you all who admits that Government may rightfully discriminate against our property, or who does not claim for the South equal rights privileges and protection with the North. This is the whole extent of our claim, and I am happy in the belief that Mississippi at heart is almost a unit in maintaining this claim.

I know there is a large party at the North pretending to be national in its principles and conservative in its sentiments, which in words admit the justice of this claim; but unfortunately their acts do not sustain their words. Like sinners who profess christianity and then sin again, these people acknowledge our rights and then violate them. I warn you against men who come to you with guile on their lips and deceit in their hearts.

They tell us with mock gravity that they ask no special protection for their property, and we must ask none for ours. They know full well that there is no prejudice against their property, and therefore they do not anticipate any hostile action. If, however, any power on earth should interfere with their rights of property, who does not know that they would be quick to demand, and Government equally quick to give protection.

What is all our legislation, Federal, State and Territorial, but a continuous effort to give special and adequate protection to personal rights and the rights of property? What are all our treaties but so many obligations entered into for the protection of private rights? We fought the battles of the revolution, declared war against Great Britain in 1812, fought Mexico in 1845-6-7, and all for what?—but to compel a decent regard for the personal and property rights of our citizens. Only two years ago an army was sent to Utah to chastise the Mormons for plundering emigrant trains. And yet the Northern people turn up their pious faces, and say, “we ask no special protection for our property, and you must ask none for yours.”

Why, fellow-citizens, for what purpose was Government ordained but to protect the citizen in his personal rights and his rights of property. He performs all his duties, pays his taxes, fights for his country—offers up his life in defence of her honor—and all for what? to be turned out like a horse to shift for himself or die? No! for the protection of his Government—adequate and sufficient protection in his life, his liberty and property. And shall he be told that if he happens to be the owner of a species of property against which fanaticism has arrayed itself, his Government may therefore outlaw him? I read in the countenance of every man who hears me the ready response, an emphatic, indignant no! We have been loyal to the Government—we have filled its coffers, we have fought its battles—we have washed its escutcheon in the blood of our veins; and, if it turn against us, we will tear down its colossal pillars and scatter them to the four winds of Heaven.

Shall we live under a Government and only know it through its power to make exactions? Better be slaves than citizens of such a Government. The master exacts obedience and honest toil, and in return he gives protection to his slave. But our Government, in the hands of these men, would exact obedience to its laws, levy tribute on our purses, demand the sacrifice of our lives, and then dismiss us from its care. The free citizen who consents without a murmur to live under such a Government deserves to be sold into bondage, and should thank his stars that his Yankee master gives him bread.

There are three classes of persons at the North who think it their privilege to discuss and decide what are our rights under the Constitution. First—those who broadly assert that Congress has the power and that it is its duty to exclude us as slaveholders from an equal participation in the use and enjoyment of the Territories—the common property of the States. Mr. Seward and his followers constitute this class. They are our enemies—so acknowledged—and we are theirs.

The second class are those who admit our equality—say that our slaves are property under the Constitution, and that we have a right to go, like other people, into the Territories, and take our property with us—and then assert that the people of the Territories, the first who get there, may, by non-action or unfriendly legislation drive us out. These are Mr. Senator Douglas and his followers. They claim to be Democrats, and shall therefore have by-and-by my respectful consideration.

The third class are those who not only admit our equality, and our equal and just right to go into the Territories and take our property with us, but who assert that we are entitled to protection after we get there—but who assert at the same time

that, although, in power they will do nothing to secure us in our rights. That is to say, that no odds how far the laws may fall short of establishing that justice, ensuring that domestic tranquility, providing for that common defence, and promoting that general welfare which were the primary objects of ordaining the Constitution—still that they will pass no other laws, but will leave us to the courts, unaided by statute laws, for our remedy. To this class the President and a majority of his Cabinet, and his Northern supporters generally belong.

Besides these, there is yet a little band, small and feeble—too few to be classed as a party—a mere handful—who assert our equality under the Constitution—our right to full, perfect, and adequate protection, and who maintain that it is their duty to use all the efforts in their power to secure us our rights. So far as I can see, they are a Spartan band fighting for naked justice, without a leader, without hope, and for the pure love of principle. If they had a leader I should love to hug him to my bosom—call him brother, and pledge him that we would fight together in defence of the Constitution, the Union, and the equal and exact rights of every part of this great Confederacy.

While I do not ignore the existence of this little band, and am even hopeful that a better day may dawn upon it. My dealing for the hour is with the other classes.

I have said of Mr. Seward and his followers that they are our enemies, and we are theirs. He has declared that there is an "irrepressible conflict" between us. So there is. He and his followers have declared war against us, and I am for fighting it out to the bitter end. It is clear that one or the other must go to the wall, and the sooner the better.

It is said by our opponents at home that in the event of Mr. Seward's election to the Presidency on the distinct basis of his Rochester speech, the South ought not to withdraw from the Union, but wait for the overt act. The election of such a man, on such an issue, will be the overt act. If it is known that a great captain has surrounded himself by his followers, and is marching at their head, with "Southern subjugation" written on his banner, are we bound to wait until he is actually in our dwellings before we prepare for resistance? If a man who is known to keep his word, threatens to shoot me on sight, am I obliged by any law, either human or divine, to wait till I am actually shot before I make defence? The election of Mr. Seward, or any other man of his party, is not *per se* justifiable grounds for dissolving the *Union*. But the *act* of putting the Government in the hands of men who mean to use it for our subjugation, ought to be resisted even to the disruption of every tie that binds us to the Union.

Whatever may be the resolves of Mr. Douglas, and however far he may have wandered from the plain teachings of the Constitution, and that great national highway that leads to national justice, I yet hope that his flock may listen to the voice of the "good shepherd," and return to the paths of duty.

Of Mr. Buchanan and his friends, I hardly know what to say. If we are to take the Constitution newspaper as the exponent of their views, I cannot hesitate to say that some of their positions are more indefensible than either Seward's or Douglas'. Seward denies us all right to Constitutional equality in the Territories—and monstrous as this assumption is, it cannot be denied that his conclusion not to give us protection, is fairly deducible from his promises. If we are not entitled as a Constitutional right to equality, it is clear we can only ask protection as a matter of grace. And in that case Mr. Seward and his friends may grant it or not, as they please. I reject with scorn his starting point, and thus show my disdain of his arguments and his conclusions.

When Mr. Douglas admits our equality, and our right to protection, he imposes on himself as one of the Supreme law-givers of this country, an obligation to assist in giving us protection. This obligation he repudiates, and sets up against it, and as paramount to it, a right on the part of the people of a Territory, no odds how few in number, by non-action or unfriendly action to deprive us of our rights. I must say that, if we are to be robbed of our rights, I prefer to have it done by Seward's congressional bandit, rather than Douglas' guerilla squatters.

Mr. Buchanan comes nearly up to the point—almost fulfills the requirements of the Constitution. But then he falters. He admits our equality, he asserts our rights to protection, denies the right of Douglas' guerilla squatters to exclude us. But when asked whether he will recommend and urge his friends in Congress to overrule the squatters, and forbid them by non-action or unfriendly legislation to deprive us of our rights, he falters, he hesitates, and finally says: "no, I can't do that." Mr. Buchanan and his followers tell us if we are deprived of our rights we have an appeal to court. And, pray, what does Mr. Douglas tell us? "if you are denied your rights, go to court." Most generous shepherds! Noble guardians of our rights! - May we not go to court as well and as safely without your counsel as with it? How often shall we tell you that this sending us to court is an insulting mockery? How are we to get into court on the complaint that the Legislature has done nothing—passed no law for our protection? How shall we maintain a suit for our rights against a statute so unfriendly as to exclude us, and yet so cunningly worded as to lie completely within the purview of the Constitution.

Mr. Seward proposes to exclude us by the direct vote of Congress. Mr. Douglas says no, this cannot be done; but if you will resort to the *hocus pocus* of non-action or unfriendly legislation, the thing can be worked out to a charm. Hold! says Mr. Buchanan, you have no right to exclude the South by direct or indirect means; but if you can so cunningly lay a scheme as to exclude her, and yet avoid responsibility in the courts, I give you my word I and my friends will not interfere.

Now, my friends, which of the three do you prefer, Seward, like a bold high-wayman, proposes to march up and snatch your rights from you by the strong arm of power; Douglas proposes to pilfer away your rights through an irresponsible territorial Legislature, which he insists has the right to rob you if it will only do it cunningly. Mr. Buchanan raises his eyes in holy horror, and declares they are both little better than burglars and thieves. But still if they do succeed in robbing you, and can escape the courts, he will not interfere. He thinks his whole duty is performed in protesting against the robbery. Neither the Constitution, nor common justice, nor a sense of gratitude for your past support has imposed on him any sort of obligation to interpose in your defence. Which of the three do you prefer? For myself, if I could be brought to choose between positions so hostile to our rights, I rather think I should prefer Seward's. It has the merit of being bold. He robs with an uplifted hand and takes the responsibility. Douglas does the thing just as effectually with more adroitness. And then with mock civility, says, if you don't like it, go to court. While Mr. Buchanan stands by, smiles graciously, and says, "for shame, gentlemen, how can you act so!" But, though panoplied in power, he does nothing to prevent the outrage.

If I do injustice to Mr. Buchanan, he may blame the editor of his organ, the "Constitution," and his Attorney-General, Judge Black—Mr. Bowman has been putting forth the rankest heresies all the summer, through his newspaper—while Judge Black has been building cob-houses, and knocking them down for the amusement of such people as take an interest in such childish sport. He assigns positions to Douglas which every school-boy ought to know he never occupied—taking care to make them of easy refutation; and then proceeds very solemnly to overthrow them. But when he comes to the real question of giving Congressional protection to slavery in the Territories, his heroism, like Bob Acres' courage, oozes out, and he is as dumb as a beetle.

In all seriousness, if Mr. Buchanan, Judge Black, or any other leading statesman of the North, is with us on the ques-



tion, why don't they say so? Do they expect to satisfy the South with honeyed words—"pulchra in facia et prætera nihil"—then they underrate our intelligence. Do they hope to escape observation under the smoke of a general fire aimed at Douglas? Then they insult our sagacity. What we demand is the undisputed right to carry our slave property into the Territories, and have it protected after we get it there—first, by the Territorial Legislature, and that failing us, then by Congress. If this right and this protection is denied us, it cannot much concern us by whom it is done, and the *modus operandi* is of the least imaginable consequence. Judge Black, and Northern politicians generally, may as well understand that a sugar-coated pill is just as nauseating in its effects as naked tartar emetic.

Instead of long "observations" on magazine articles, designed, like a French Minister's words, to obscure ideas—a very short paragraph would have answered all our purposes. "The Southern people have the same right to take their slave property to a Territory that an Eastern man has to take his dry goods, or a Western man his produce; and he has the same right to have it protected after he gets it there. And neither Congress nor the Territorial Legislature can, properly, by means direct or indirect, deny this right or withhold this protection. And whether the one or the other, or both, undertake to exercise such right, or deny such protection, we feel bound in fidelity to the Constitution, and to that equal justice which it secures, to interpose in defence of the Southern people."

Let that be the language. It is plain, practical, common sense, and to the point. We shall all understand it. He who utters it will entitle himself to our votes, and he who stops short, should encounter our stern opposition.

Let me not be misunderstood in regard to the President. As represented by his newspaper organ, he falls, in my judgment, immeasurably short of doing us justice. As represented by his Attorney General, he theorizes well. He admits our right, under the Constitution, to take our slave property to the Territories, and our constitutional right to have it protected after we get it there. But when we ask, "To whom shall we appeal, in case our constitutional rights are not respected?" Like Douglas, he points to the courts. I have so often combatted Douglas when he has pointed us to the courts as our only refuge, that I feel almost ashamed to repeat the same arguments in reply to the President.

To refer us to the courts for our remedy, is nothing short of downright mockery. And it is not a whit less insulting to our intelligence when done by the President, than when done by Judge Douglas.

It is proposed to exclude us from the Territories by non-action and by unfriendly legislation—legislation so cunningly devised as not to outrage the Constitution. And then we are told, if injustice has been done us, we must seek our remedy in court.

Let me ask you, fellow-citizens, what figure I should cut in court, complaining that the Legislature had done nothing? How should I base my action? On what grounds should I evoke the judgment of the court? If I went to court on such a complaint, a courteous and intelligent judge would be very certain to inform me that I had mistaken my tribunal; that it was the duty of the Legislature to pass laws, and of the court to enforce them; and as my complaint was based on the non-action of the Legislature, it must be addressed to the Legislature, and not to the court.

Nor should I be less at fault in complaining of an unfriendly statute, so cunningly put up by Judge Douglas as not to violate the Constitution, and which should yet be entirely effective for my exclusion! The court would say, "We sit to adjudicate rights under the law and the Constitution. You do not base your claims on any law. But you admit the law to be unfriendly to your claim; and, therefore, unless you can show that the law violates the Constitution, we shall be compelled to dismiss your complaint."

Our antagonists are almost all lawyers, and they understand perfectly well that the Constitution secures rights, but that it is left to the Legislature to supply remedies; and that legal rights without legal remedies are nullities. The constitutional rights of a citizen are the same in Kansas that they are in Mississippi. But need I ask you if the remedies are the same. Here your rights are valuable, because you have laws whereby to enforce them; there your rights are worthless, because you have no laws, or law unfriendly to your rights.

Now, let me take a familiar example by way of illustration: Suppose John Smith removes from Mississippi to Kansas, and takes his slave property with him. This I understand Judge Douglas, Judge Black, the President, and the Northern Democracy generally, to admit he has a right to do. I understand them to admit that Smith is entitled under the Constitution to protection for his property, after he gets it there. But he finds no law in force affording him protection. He appeals to the local Legislature, and it flatly refuses to give him aid. He goes to these gentlemen and says: "You admitted my right to go to Kansas with my slaves, and my right to have them protected after I got them there. There is no law in force for my protection, and the local Legislature has refused, on my direct appeal, to pass such laws. You made

that Legislature, and you can unmake it. I appeal to you for that protection to which you say I am entitled under the Constitution." "Aye," says Douglas, "you are entitled to protection. But if the Legislature chooses to deny it, you have no remedy but by an appeal to court. I will not interfere." Without stopping to debate with Douglas the absurdity of going to court for his remedy under such circumstances, he turns to the President. The President sends for the Attorney-General, and Smith states his case. The Attorney-General, at great length, argues Smith's right, under the Constitution, to take his slave property into Kansas, and concludes that, having the right, it follows, *ex necessitate rei*, that he is entitled to protection after he gets it there. To all this the President assents. Smith feels awkward in this great presence, but ventures to say, "The rights you speak of are not recognized in Kansas, and will you oblige me by saying how I am to enforce them?" "Why," says the Attorney-General, "appeal to the courts." "Exactly," adds the President, "and when you have a judgment, I will see that it is enforced, if need be, at the point of the bayonet." "Why," says Smith, "that is exactly what Douglas told me." "Yes," continues the Attorney-General, "but Judge Douglas claims that the Legislature of Kansas, by doing nothing, or by doing unfriendly acts, may *rightfully* exclude you, and that I deny." "That's our position," adds the President. "The Administration denies that the people of a Territory, by non-action or by unfriendly action, can *rightfully* exclude you with your slave property. This, I assure you, Mr. Smith, is our position." "But," says Smith, "I have been to Kansas with my slaves, and they have been decoyed from my possession, and spirited into Canada, by the underground railroad, and I have found no remedy." "Why did you not appeal to the courts?" says the President. "I did," says Smith. "I first called on a lawyer from Illinois, and he told me that I had been shamefully treated; that my rights under the Constitution had been violated, but that I had no remedy, for there was no law to meet my case. I next called on a lawyer from Mississippi—I think his name was Smedes. He told me my remedy was at common law, and he first proposed a civil suit to recover the value of my property. I told him there was no use in that, for the man who decoyed and carried off my slaves was not worth a sou. 'Then,' said he, 'we will indict him for larceny—grand larceny, for stealing property, under the Constitution, of the value of one thousand dollars and more.' The Grand Jury was friendly and brought in a true bill. The case was set down for hearing. The counsel for the defence argued forcibly on the testimony that it was not larceny; first,

for the reason that the negro was not taken from my possession—he ran away; and next, that he was not converted to the use of the defendant, but was then, and had all the time been a free man in Canada. The court hesitated, but finally solved its doubts in favor of justice. The petit jury being also friendly, returned a verdict of guilty. The Judge looked confused, and asked lawyer Smedes under what statute he should proceed to sentence the accused. Mr. Smedes replied, with an air of confidence, ‘Under the statute against larceny.’ ‘Stop,’ said the defense. ‘The indictment is for the larceny of property of the value of one thousand dollars, and the proof shows the thing stolen to have been a negro slave, claimed as property under the Constitution. But our statute says: ‘larceny’ shall be the felonious taking and carrying away, with the intent of converting the same to the use of the taker, the horses, cattle, hogs, or other personal chattels of another, *‘slaves excepted.’* ‘What!’ says Mr. Smedes, *‘slaves excepted?’* How came that exception? ‘Why,’ says the defence, ‘that is what Mr. Douglas and his friends mean by ‘unfriendly legislation; and as neither you nor the President, nor anybody else, has provided a remedy against it, we claim affirmation of our motion, in arrest of judgment.’ At this point the jury stared, the crowd gaped, the counsel wondered, the Judge said, ‘discharge the prisoner,’ and old Ossawatimie Brown—it was he that stole the negro—wanted to know if I didn’t feel a little foolish.”

To sum up the whole matter in controversy between the North and South: We pay our taxes for the support of Government; we shed our blood and expose our lives to sustain our national honor; we perform all our duties as true and loyal citizens; we are entitled to equal privileges, and to equal and exact protection, in all places, at all times, and under all circumstances. When Government fails to recognize these privileges, or to award this protection, it fails in the great objects for which it was ordained, and ought to be abolished.

Northern statesmen, by whatever party designation they may be known, must be made to understand that fine-spun theories, however cunningly worded, or party ties, however sanctified by age, are not to stand in the way of a clear and distinct recognition of our rights under the Constitution.

We have not been backward in the past, nor will we be in the future, in vindicating the property rights of our Northern brothers. Whenever and wherever their rights have been denied, on the land or on the seas, our chivalrous arms have gleamed in the hottest of the conflict. If the time has come when it is demanded of us that we live up to all the require-

ments of the Constitution, bear all the burdens of Government, and yet admit that we are not equals in the Government, and not entitled to equal privileges, and equal protection; then the time has come for us to say to our Northern brothers, "you have shown that you are our enemies and we are yours."

It is useless to appeal to me in the name of the Democratic party, or of any other party. There was a day when party names signified a great deal. We all know what Democracy signified in the days of Jefferson, Madison, Jackson, and Polk. It meant equality and exact justice to all parts of the Confederacy. True Democracy means nothing else now; and no spurious article shall be palmed off on me as a genuine article. I abhor Douglas' Squatter Sovereignty. I detest the good Lord, good Devil policy of the Washington "Constitution." I am not satisfied with Attorney-General Black's "Observations" on Douglas' magazine article. I regard with distrust all politicians, North and South, who hesitate to declare in favor of Congressional protection of slavery in the Territories. And I await with great patience and little hope, the *expose* which we are to have from the President at the opening of Congress.

Fellow citizens, we are shortly to meet our "Northern brethren" in Convention at Charleston. The Convention is to be one of great significance. If the South lowers its flag, all is lost. No man in the South doubts our right to equal justice, and equal protection to our property on the high seas and in the Territories. No man in the North who loves the Union, reveres the Constitution, and wants to do justice, will dispute our claim to be put on an equal footing with the people of the North. **WE ASK NO MORE.** But there will be attempts to hoodwink us with fair promises and expressions of kind regard. We shall be told we are the cleverest fellows in the world—brim full of chivalry, and that all our just demands must and shall be respected. And then the manipulating process will begin. We shall be asked to yield a very little on this point, and then on that, and again on some other. The Syren will continue to chant delicious music in our ears; and if we listen, the end will be that we shall be led far away from that shrine which is devotion to our country. You are about to appoint delegates to the Convention at Charleston. My advice to you is plainly this: appoint discreet, sensible men of established reputation—men thoroughly imbued with the sentiment, that the South has equal rights in confederacy with the North—and *above all, men whose antecedents give unmistakable evidence that they will not betray you.*

I am not remarkably sanguine as to the results at Charleston. Perhaps I am not because I feel a certain sort of presentment

that things will be managed to our prejudice. If I could feel assured that the National Democracy would, in good earnest, and with a hearty good will, step on a platform which recognized the equality of the States, and the equal and exact right of every species of property to full and adequate protection wherever it might be, I would perform a pilgrimage on foot to Charleston to witness such a consummation. But my hopes are mingled with many doubts on these points. I fear we shall have a repetition of the old scenes—Apocryphal sentences strung together, meaning anything or everything, or nothing, just as one chooses to construe them. We may be offered the Cincinnati platform in *haec verba*—I would reject it without a word of debate. After all that has transpired, it is insulting to our intelligence to offer us a platform with a Northern and a Southern side. We know that in practice our side will be deserted. Therefore, those who accept such a platform, agree in advance to see the South betrayed.

I would demand the full measure of justice and draw the bond in such plain English that no one could misread or misconstrue it. And failing in this demand, I would withdraw instantly from the Convention.

Ah! we are told that this course, on the part of the South, will break up the National Democratic party. Well, suppose it does? For what end was the party organized? In the language of the Constitution, it was ordained to establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, and promote the general welfare. If instead of meeting these just ends, it defeats justice, promotes discord, provides for the defence of the North, and promotes only that interest which is hostile to the South, then I have no hesitation in saying it ought to be broken up.

Let no one suppose that Democratic principles will be endangered by the withdrawal of the South from the present Democratic organization. When Luther, and Melancthon, and Zwingle, and John Knox, and Calvin protested against the Romish Church, they did not destroy, nay! they did not even wound true Christianity. And when bold John Wesley denounced the corruptions of the English Church, he only let in upon it that true and Heavenly light which was essential to its triumph. Democracy is nearly allied to Christianity, and they need alike to be pruned of all corruption to insure their vigorous and successful growth.

I have no hesitation in advising my party friends in Mississippi to stand firmly by their avowed principles. These principles are worth more to us than party associations. We cannot long remain in a Union where even our own professed friends do not recognize our just claim to equal rights and

equal protection. The old Democratic party is dear to me, I have spent the best part of my life in defending its principles. If now it has made up it's mind to discard the first great cardinal idea of its creed, that of justice to all, and special privileges to none, I am prepared to spend the remainder of days in making war upon it.

I have spoken to you plainly, my friends, as became me, occupying the relation I do to you, and those you represent. There may be those among you who find fault with what I have said. Well, be it so, I am used to such treatment and can bear it with composure. If then you do not admit that I have this night addressed you in the language of truth and soberness, I shall be ready for any sacrifice to which you may condemn me.

OBERLIN  
COLLEGE  
LIBRARY